

CHURCH MISSIONS,

&c.

&c.

COMPILED

BY

COLONEL LOWRY.

HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA,

JAMES DOWES & SONS, HOLLIS STREET.

FOR SALE AT MISS EATZMAN'S, W. GOSSIP'S, & Z. S. HALL'S.

1868.

The EDITH *and* LORNE PIERCE
COLLECTION *of* CANADIANA



Queen's University at Kingston

COLL
HALL
48262

CHURCH MISSIONS,

&c.

&c.

COMPILED

BY

COLONEL LOWRY.

HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA,
JAMES BOWES & SONS, HOLLIS STREET,
FOR SALE AT MISS KATZMAN'S, W. GOSSIP'S, & Z. S. HALL'S.
1868.

INTRODUCTION.

MUCH of the substance of the following Lecture has been addressed, in course of the last few years, to audiences in different parts of the Dominion of Canada. In putting it in a more lasting form before the Members of the Church, I would desire to repeat, and to record the remarks with which I have, on the occasions referred to, prefaced it.

The Lecture is, to a large extent, a compilation from the writings and accounts of others. It has been drawn from many sources—from what I have read, from what I have heard, and from what I have seen. Deeply interested in missionary work I have for years noted down whatever has seemed to me note worthy and reliable, or to tend to the elucidation of the subject, without intending to make any public use of it, and, at times, without quoting my authority. I jotted down, from time to time, from the writings, or from the spoken addresses of the wise and good whatever approved itself to my mind and heart. The allegory, and to a considerable extent the language in which it is clothed, and the subject introduced have been taken from the works of the late Rev. Henry Newland.

In early life it was my great privilege to have been for a short time in the Parish of which the present Bishop of Oxford was the Rector, and in the many years which have since intervened, wherever I have been within the reach of his Lordship's teaching, I have loved to profit by. Often, too, when far removed from that voice and mind of singular power and wisdom have I read, and pondered on their weighty utterances. Years may have elapsed since heard or seen, but the thoughts called up, and, not infrequently, even the *form* in which they left their impress, remain. Often they may appear—sometimes almost insensibly to

myself—in the pages of this Lecture. To the reader and to myself this acknowledgment is due: to the good Bishop I owe more than I can ever express.

Throughout the following account of the Church's Missionary history and progress I have used unsparingly, the thoughts and words of others—where they have come home to me with the force of truth—rather than my own. Hence indeed is derived any value which it may possess. I have for the most part only ventured to confirm, or illustrate the statements made, by a reference to what I have observed as I have moved through the world. To the Clergy there will be little new in this brief treatise on Church Missions. It is chiefly designed to enlist the interest and affection of the Laity in a work in which, assuredly, all are equally concerned. As the effort of a layman, who has passed the last seven or eight years in this fair land of British America, and who amid the active occupations of a Profession claiming his chief attention, has ever found a deep enjoyment in Church work, these pages may serve to call forth a like interest in others. If they arouse a determination on the part of any to be more whole-hearted and in earnest in the support of our Diocesan Church Societies, and to build up the Church—in the integrity and completeness of her organization—in remote settlements, as in our midst, my lay sermon will not have been preached in vain.

HALIFAX, N. S., October, 1868.

Church Missions.

THERE was a very singular and beautiful print once in the *Illustrated News*. It was the representation of the legend of St. Christopher: a powerful giant, supporting his steps by an uprooted fir tree, is bending under the weight of the Infant Christ, Whom he carries on his shoulders. He is proceeding steadily along a beaten path, followed by kings, priests, nobles, artizans, and farmers. Old and young, down to the very children, are following in the steps of him who carries the Holy Infant, Whose hand is stretched out in the attitude of blessing.

This is the symbolizing of a real Church Mission. The giant upon whose shoulders is seated the Infant Saviour is the nation to whom, for the time, Christ has committed the office of evangelizing the world. It is a heavy duty, and the bearer bends under the weight of it; but in the act of performing it, he has acquired the strength to perform it. His proportions are already gigantic; he out-tops by the head and shoulders all the figures that are around him; his limbs seem capable of sustaining far more than the weight they carry; and the fir tree, uprooted from where it grew beside his path—that is to say, the natural advantages which present themselves in the very path of his duty—supports his steps; for, be it observed, he is not taking a devious or arbitrary course, but following the beaten path—the path marked out to him by the Eternal Wisdom, and direct Revelation of God.

The remainder of the picture explains itself; it is the natural fruit of his labors. He carries the true Christ, and high and low, rich and poor, young and old, kings and subjects, priests and shepherds, alike blessed by the outstretched Hand, crowd after the giant that bears it. Willingly and cheerfully they swell his retinue, and contribute to his earthly pomp and glory.

Now this has been for ages past the way in which our blessed Saviour carries on the missionary work of his Church. "God," says an old proverb, "is a good workman, but He likes to have men to help Him." In the Infant Church, as in the infant settlement of the Israelites in the promised land, which is a type of it, He governed by His own immediate power; but from the time

when that prophecy was fulfilled, which assigns kings as the nursing fathers, and queens as the nursing mothers of His Church—from that time forward the infant Christ, the young Church, was carried on the shoulders of some one nation to which it was committed.—That nation was pre-eminent as long as it discharged its office. Whenever it failed in that duty, the mission was entrusted to some other nation, which in its turn became pre-eminent, till that nation became unfaithful to its trust, and in its turn was relieved, not only of the burthen of the Christ, which it was unworthy to bear, but of the earthly pomp, and power, and strength, and glory, which are the rewards, as well as the consequences, of bearing Him. “No cross, no crown,” is as true of nations, as it is of individuals. Rome first received the holy burthen under Constantine; then Germany under Charlemagne; then Spain under Ferdinand and Isabella; then England under Victoria.

Each of the former once was faithful, and did the Lord’s work in the Lord’s way, but each in their turn failed, and their earthly as well as their heavenly power passed from them.

God grant that the Lord may find His resting place where He has vouchsafed to choose it now! God grant that England, the giant that now carries Him, of whom it may be said now, as was said with equal truth by her predecessor Spain, that on her empire the sun never sets—whose ships and colonies and commerce and wealth, are the purse and scrip which God commits to her charge for a definite purpose—whose grandeur and power are not only the *consequences* of having borne the Christ, but the *means* of bearing Him onward yet—God grant that she may profit by the history of faded or fading nations, and may set forth her own glory by setting forth that of her Lord’s.

In endeavouring to show the cause of the comparative failure of our Indian missions, I would not undervalue the present or past sacrifices which individuals or societies are making, or have made, in the cause of God’s truth. We do not undervalue the labours of Schwartz or the self-sacrifice of Martin, when we show why those labours, and that self-sacrifice have produced no adequate fruit. Successive missions, if they be carried out in honesty and truth, like successive Arctic expeditions, open the way to subsequent explorers, and that nearly as much by their failures, as by their successes. Still, we must treat those failures honestly; we must give honour to those who did their work faithfully, but we must endeavor to point out how it came to pass that, though they all built upon that foundation without which no man can build, that is Jesus Christ—yet, that when their work came to be tried, as we read every man’s work will be tried, such a large proportion turned out

to be of perishable materials, and such a very small residuum of precious elements remained.

This is not the way people generally speak of missions in India, or anywhere else. It is wholesome, sometimes, to look at our virtues, provided we do not make them a set-off against our faults; but it is still more wholesome to contemplate our faults themselves: they are not likely to blind us to our virtues.

Had it not been for our own faults, for those of the nation which now bears Christ on its shoulders, might not India now be Christian, or nearly so? How long was it from the preaching of St. Augustine before England became Christian? How long was it after the mission of St. Anskar before Sweden became Christian? Yet St. Augustine and St. Anskar were poor missionaries, sent by a church almost as poor as themselves. They were not backed by the influence and enterprise of a warlike, wealthy, and commercial nation. Schwartz laboured for fifty years. Why was he not the St. Anskar of India? Suppose we were living in the year *two thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight*, and we were reading the ancient history of England, as we might now be reading the history of Rome under Constantine, or of France and Germany under Charlemagne, how we should wonder at that little insignificant spot in the map of the world, which the geographer would then point to as the source and origin of that mighty power, and call it England! how we should wonder when he pointed afterwards across the broad expanse of British India, and said that all this had been the dominion of a company of merchants from that little spot.

A few thousand of their countrymen, placed by the sovereign of that country under their direction, were quite sufficient to govern, and to legislate, and to administer justice, and to subdue rebellion, and to carry on external wars and internal administration; for the people whom they governed obeyed them willingly.

"These are the people," will the Lecturer of those days be saying, "whom the Prophet Isaiah designates, when, in answer to the question, 'Who raised up the righteous man from the East, and called him to his foot?' declares, 'I have raised up one from the North, and he shall come.'"

It was not the force of arms, but the truth and equity of the English character, that made all men flock to this empire for justice and protection. This will be a wonderful relation when it appears in history; but a greater wonder remains behind—that this nation whose rule was so eagerly sought—who had risen into supreme power by the simple force of its character for energy and justice—had governed that great land, its willing slave, for a hundred or more years, and had produced no effect worth speaking of on the

heathenism of the country. In every element of strength, in every fruit of religion, the natives readily acknowledged themselves the inferiors of their masters, but to the *religion which produced* this difference they were not converted.

The religion lay open before them with its fruits ; they admitted the fruits, but they did not admit the cause which produced them ; they chose Christians for their masters, but they remained heathen. This anomaly is more astounding than the other, and a most useful lesson it is to enquire into the causes of it.

India has been, for the last one hundred years, English ; why is not India Christian ? Perhaps the first reason that suggests itself will be the difficulty of caste, and it is a real difficulty—we need not deny it ; but if there had been no difficulties to encounter, the world would have been Christian centuries ago. Had St. Anskar and St. Augustine no difficulties to encounter in the wild roving habits, the constant wars, the perpetual marauding expeditions, which were then considered honorable by the nations they converted ? The difficulty of caste is this. The whole of native Hindoo society is arranged in castes or ranks. These have nothing to do with rich or poor—there are rich and poor in almost all of them—they are classes in sanctity. They imagine that any man would lose his caste if he associated in any way with a man in a class below him. We may easily understand this from the Bible, where we are told meat was set on for Joseph by himself, and for the Egyptians by themselves ; for the Egyptians may not eat with the Israelites, though Joseph was at that time Governor of all Egypt. This may not possibly be a great obstacle in the way of *government*—it was not in the case of Joseph—but it is a very great obstacle indeed in the way of the missionary, because, according to the spirit of his religion, the Christian is the brother of the lowest. Whatever, therefore, the missionary may be, high or low, rich or poor, in a religious point of view, according to the estimation of the natives, he ranks with the very lowest : the man one caste above the lowest cannot eat, not only with him, but with the very Governor of India, the very Queen of England, without being polluted.

This is a real difficulty then, but that it is a difficulty in prospect rather than in actual operation is quite evident when we consider that our Indian subjects are composed of two races—Hindoos and Mahometans—that the difficulties of caste belong exclusively to the former, and that our missions have made little more way with one of these classes of men than they have with the other. If caste had been the real difficulty, we should have converted the Mahometans by this time. The difficulties which have beset us are of a more serious character, because they are traceable to ourselves ; and

though God will not render us responsible for those He puts in our way, if we do our best to overcome them, He will render us responsible for those which we put in our own way, whether they arise from our sins, our negligences, or our jealousies.

It is idle to talk of our missionary successes in India as some do. A few thousands have been here and there converted, there is no doubt; quite enough to show that we might have done better; but if we have converted thousands where we might reasonably have been expected to convert *millions*, the mission cannot be considered anything but a comparative failure.

Might we not reasonably have been expected to have converted millions in India? Compare what has been done by modern missions with that which has been done by ancient missions—that of the German missionaries *before* the days of Charlemagne. *After* those days they were supported by the arms of an Empire relatively as powerful as that of England now; but before those days the missions were the unaided efforts of a band of devoted Churchmen.

How long did it take not only to establish Christianity in all those lands, but absolutely to root out heathenism, so that no traces of it remained? Was it as long as since our first establishment in India?

And remember—these missionaries came from lands not much advanced in civilization beyond the heathen tribes they converted, while ours had the wealth of commerce, the arts and sciences of civilization, the experience of ages, and the prestige of conquest, to back it? The comparison is humiliating; yet it must be made if we would profit by our past failures, and turn to real account those energies, which, hitherto, we have suffered to waste away, like water poured on the sands of a desert.

If of two missions, one has succeeded, and the other almost failed, the first thing to be done is to see in what constitutional element the one differed from the other. Now there are many examples we might take of *successful* missions. All Europe was heathen, and now all Europe is Christian—therefore all Europe was once converted by missionary exertions. We will however choose that mission with which most of us are more or less acquainted—I mean the mission of St. Augustine to England—by which we who, among the numerous invasions of the heathen Saxons, had well nigh lost all trace of our early Church—were once more brought into the fold of Christ.

We need not consider this a Roman Catholic mission in the modern acceptation of the term. In words no doubt it is so, Catholic Christians who lived in Rome must be Roman Catholics, just as Catholic Christians who live in France are French Catholics.

and Catholic Christians who live in England are English Catholics. But, if this be true in words, it is not true in fact. Almost all those doctrines, which we popularly call Romish, have one by one crept into the Church of Rome since that time. In those days the doctrines of the Church of Rome were very nearly what ours are now, and what the doctrines of the Apostles were before them. And Gregory was the very man, who first resisted the claim of another to be styled Universal Bishop, and who refused the like title when offered to himself.

The history of the mission is this. Gregory, then Bishop of Rome, seeing some English captives, and lamenting that so fine a race of men should be given to idolatry, determined if possible to evangelize them. The first thing he did was to seek out a band of men who were willing to undertake the work, and then to place a missionary Bishop at the head of them. This Bishop was Augustine. Why Augustine was consecrated to the office by the Bishop of Arles in France, instead of being consecrated by the Bishop of Rome, the founder of the mission, is not known; but the fact shows this: that other churches, besides that of Rome, took an interest in this work of God. Here you will observe the first differences between the ancient missions, and our own. The only society that was formed for the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was the society of those men who were to go; there was no society for sending them: they were sent by the Church. Another difference is that at their head there was a Bishop unfettered by Acts of Parliament about ordaining and consecrating. He was competent "to ordain elders in every city" in which he should succeed in establishing a Church, but where was the money for their support to come from, if there was no society at home? No doubt the earlier missionaries fared hardly at first; no doubt, like their Divine Master, they often had not where to lay their heads. But, though in those days there was no rule of celibacy among the clergy any more than there is with us now, though we find these men and their successors, *after* they had established themselves in Churches of their own founding, exercising their priestly duties as married men and bringing up their children as Christians—yet we do *not* find them *setting out* on their missions with their domestic comforts about them. Hardships they went through at first, but soon it came that they who preached the Gospel began to live of the Gospel. Beyond a doubt even such missions, as these were not self-supporting at first. They drew their first sustenance from the Church that sent them. We must not forget that, in those days, offertories really *were* offertories, where men offered of their substance, that is to say, *in proportion to their*

substance ; that the poor were supported by them, that Churches were endowed, and missions furnished. A good many years after this, when the worship of saints had crept into the Church, a writer complains that “*ten thousands* were offered at the altar of St. Thomas, before a *thousand* was offered at the altar of God.” This will give us some idea what offertories *used* to be ; we do not talk about them by *thousands now*.

The mission of Augustine to England took place early in the year 597. Ethelbert was then not only King of Kent, but exercised a kind of imperial authority as far as the Humber. He was married to Bertha, a French Princess and a Christian. The mind of the King was probably, on that account, prepared to receive the mission courteously, and to listen with respect to what they had to say. In answer to the interpreters sent by Augustine he granted an interview, directing that it should be in the open air, as, it appears, he had some suspicion of magic arts, and wished to see everything himself, and form his own judgment. He was a man of strong sense, and sound judgment, as his words will show. Augustine arranged his monks in procession, and placed himself at the head ; his tall commanding figure conspicuous amongst the rest. He was “higher than any of his people from his shoulders and upwards.” As the missionaries slowly advanced they chanted under the guidance of Honorius—Gregory’s own pupil—one of those deeply solemn litanies known to after ages as “Gregorian,” and which, heard for the first time by barbarian ears, must have deeply impressed them. The King gave them a respectful welcome ; invited the missionaries to be seated, while Augustine himself, under the shadow of the ancient oak, which canopied the royal retinue, proclaimed by his interpreters in few and simple words the Gospel message. The answer of the King was a very memorable one, and deserves to be quoted for its rare sense. “Very fair,” said he, “are the words you have uttered, and the promises you make. But to us these things are new, and their full meaning I do not understand. I am not prepared to give my assent to them, and renounce the customs which I have so long observed with the whole Anglo-Saxon race. But you have come from far. You are strangers ; and I clearly perceive that your sole wish and only object is to communicate to us what you believe to be good and true. You shall not be molested. You shall be hospitably entertained ; we will make provision for your maintenance, and we do not prohibit you from uniting to your society any persons whom you may persuade to embrace your faith.”

The Missionaries conducted themselves with consistent simplicity, and devoted themselves to the instruction of the people in the

Gospel. Their labours were soon rewarded. Ethelbert declared himself a Christian, and was baptized. Crowds speedily followed the example, and Gregory states in a letter to the Patriarch Eulogius that ten thousand were baptized in one day. The missionaries were soon established within the walls of Canterbury. The King gave up his palace to Augustine for a residence, and on the adjacent grounds the foundations of the first Cathedral were laid. The house that Augustine first occupied after crossing to England has lately been restored, and put to its original use. It is a College for the education of missionary priests. I visited it eight years ago when the late Bishop Mackenzie was about to proceed on his mission to Central Africa.

There were assembled in Canterbury Cathedral at the farewell service on that deeply interesting occasion, over three hundred Clergymen, and three thousand laymen. It would be hard, I think, to efface from the minds of any then present the memory of that solemn service, or of the earnest counsel that day delivered by England's most eloquent Prelate.

"Who," said the Bishop of Oxford, "standing in this glorious Building, as his eyes drink in its shadows and its lights, but must cast back the glance of his memory along all the marvellous steps by which, even unto this day, our course has been guided by our God." "Go back," he said, "in thought to the time when the first Evangelizer of Britain crossed, with the message of Christ's power, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost, the neighbouring straits which parted us from advancing Christendom. Compare the wild forests and marshes of that day, compare their wilder inhabitants with the sights and purposes of this day, and surely—looking around us at home, and across the Westward waves to our daughter Church in America we may say with more than the Patriarch's gratitude, 'with my staff I passed over this Jordan, and now I am become two bands.'"

As the Church increased, Augustine became Archbishop, and his chief difficulties seem to have arisen after his elevation to this high position. It is related that he was at a loss as to what liturgy to use in the newly erected churches. There were, it is well known, four principal liturgies in the early Church. The liturgy of St. James, which was followed generally in the Eastern Churches—the liturgy of St. Mark, which was followed in Egypt and Abyssinia,—the Roman, claiming the authority of St. Peter,—and the Gallican, derived probably through Irenæus from Ephesus and St. John. In the small church of St. Martin, reserved to the Queen, the Gallican liturgy had been hitherto observed.

Augustine greatly preferred that of his country, at the same time that he did not wish to displease the Queen by substituting it for the Gallican. In his difficulty he consulted Gregory, who advised him, in arranging the services of the English Church, "not to tie himself down to the Roman ritual, or to the Gallican, or to any other, but to select out of every church what is pious, religious, and right, and so to form a new liturgy for the Church of England, for," he added, "things are not to be valued on account of places, but places for the good things they contain."

Had a missionary band been sent out in modern times, we should probably have found it uncontrolled by episcopal or synodical action, scattered over the whole south of England; each member of it collecting and teaching his own congregation in his own way, and reporting his own good deeds to his own society at home; jealous of his brethren, and still more jealous of some rival society. But these men, while they preached but one Catholic and Apostolic Church, *exhibited but one*.

As the Church took root in the land it began to throw out its branches. Canterbury became the metropolis or mother city of the Church of England. It sent out its own missions to other towns, just as it had been itself a mission of Rome. These missions were exact models of the original mission, headed by Bishops, not of foreign ordination, but consecrated from its own body. The earliest missions from Canterbury were to Winchester and Selsey, but those soon ramified till the greater part of the South of England became evangelized, had their parishes and their parsons, and were under the superintendence of their own Bishops.

The form of the Church was never lost: in the beginning it consisted of thirty persons, the members who, with Augustine, landed on the shores of Kent; but in those thirty persons there were Bishop, Priests, Deacons, and Laymen. It was a perfect Church—the Apostles' *fellowship*, as well as their *doctrine*. It never lost the form in which Christ had cast it, and so it never lost the promise of His perpetual presence!

Now compare this with the efforts of our societies. A Church produced a Church, but a society could not produce a Church. Every failure experienced by our missions was not a failure of the Church, but of individuals in it collected together, not by the rules of Christ, but by rules of their own forming. Let me illustrate this by a story of the great missionary Wolff.

Dr. Wolff was travelling in some out-of-the-way place in the far east, in the diocese of one of the Bishops of the Eastern, or Greek Church, and in the course of his wanderings he fell in with the Bishop. "Who are you?" said his Lordship, looking at him

over suspiciously. "A poor missionary," said the Doctor. "*A what?*" said the Bishop. "A missionary," said Dr. Wolff, pulling out his Bible, and opening it at the precise text he wanted. "I am come to preach salvation to these poor people. 'How shall they call upon Him, on whom they have not believed, or how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard, or how shall they hear without a preacher?'" "That is all very well," said the Bishop, "but why don't you finish the text? 'How shall they preach except they be sent?' Who sent you?" "Sent," said Wolff. "Yes, sent," said the Bishop—"My metropolitan sent me, and his predecessors sent him, and I send my priests and deacons. Now who sent you?" "The Spirit of the Lord," said Wolff boldly, for he was not a man to be put out of countenance. "I hope you do not deny that Christ is able to send His own messengers without human intervention?" "God forbid that I should doubt it for one moment," said the Bishop. "I know that He sent Moses and Aaron without human intervention, and I know that He superseded this very priesthood of His own ordination, by sending, also without human intervention, the Apostolic Priesthood, and what He did once, He can do again. Still I have always observed that whenever He sends any one directly from Himself He is pleased to confirm His own appointment to the minds of His servants by signs and wonders. Moses called down bread from Heaven. He and Aaron brought forth waters from the rock. And when it pleased God to supersede their priesthood, many wonders and signs were wrought by the hands of the Apostles." "Where are your witnesses," continued the Bishop, "what supernatural powers do you appeal to in proof of your heavenly mission?" This was a puzzler; it had been so to Mohammed several hundred years ago, but the prophet got out of it by saying that he had written the Koran, which, as every one could see, was a miracle in itself. Wolff could not say he had written the Bible, so he fell a-thinking, and the result was he came home *not a better man*—for a most excellent one he was always—but a *wiser man*.

Till lately, as regards missionary efforts, the Church of England had dropped that note of its Apostolic character: it had lost not the power of reproducing itself, but the *will*!

Why—incredible as it seems—it is yet true that, for one hundred years, there existed an Episcopal Church on this continent without a Bishop, and the Church which had the protection of the Government of England was that which was left without organization! In vain did the Church plead for redress; year after year

did the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel make strenuous efforts to remedy the evil, but—while the State permitted the Roman Catholic Church to have what Bishops she pleased—the sons and daughters of the Church of England in America were left without the ministrations pledged to them at their baptism.

To what then but our own neglect can we attribute the growth on this continent of such innumerable varieties of religious denominations? It is certain, too, that nothing so tended to bring about the revolution which severed so large a portion of North America from the mother country as the neglect of her spiritual duties to her children.

The exertions which were made were those of *individuals*, and, though they were not without that share of blessing and success, never denied to holy purposes, and prayerful men, the nature of that success was—what might have been expected—desultory and uncertain.

This was the character of our Indian missions, and, to a great extent, of all our missions.

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts, which was founded in the year 1701, may in some sense be considered a cast of the Church, and in these days when she appears to be rousing herself and reassuming some of her ancient functions, it may, perhaps, be moulded into an efficient implement of united and vigorous missionary action. But at the close of the last century society after society was set on foot, and these societies were all more or less distinct from one another in doctrine and government. The blame must be on ourselves: the Church in those days was dormant and supine.

In 1792 the Baptist Missionary Society was formed; in 1795 the London Society, conducted chiefly by the Independents, was formed for the same purpose. In the following year the Scotch Association was formed by the Presbyterians, and in 1800 the Church Missionary Society was originated for the purpose of Christianizing the heathen in Africa.

Seventeen years afterwards the Wesleyans consolidated a similar association, and from that time to this many others have been formed. All these disseminate in rivalry each its own peculiar tenets in every quarter of the globe. What success has attended these conflicting efforts to extend the Gospel, and bring mankind into obedience to its precepts?

“It is indeed,” says Grant, “a melancholy reflection that from our shores Christianity should go forth not in one shape, but in shapes as many-formed as individual conviction and zeal can make them: that all our dissensions should be propagated and reproduced

amongst the heathen; that the gift of God, designed to be the healer of nations, should become the spring of strife and debate; that the Pagan mind, becoming just awakened to the truth, should have that truth presented to it in a variety of forms, and when disposed to look out from itself to receive the counsel of God, should thus be thrown into utter doubt as to which of all these systems is the right one." "We should like your religion," said a Brahmin, "*if there were not so many of them!*" The deplorable effects of this were very strikingly illustrated by the Metropolitan of New Zealand at the Church Congress last year, at Wolverhampton. Bishop Selwyn said: "When in the very heart of New Zealand, on the shore of Tampo Lake, I went to one of the most remarkable of the New Zealand chieftains, noted for his hospitality to strangers, and when I asked him why he refused to be a Christian, he stretched out three fingers, and, pointing to the centre joint, said: 'I have come to a spot from which I see three roads branching. This is the Church of England, this is the Church of Rome, and this is the Wesleyan. I am sitting down here doubting which to take.' And he sat there at those cross roads doubting till he died in a wonderful manner. One night there was a land-slip, the village was overwhelmed, and that chieftain died in unbelief because of the divisions of Christian men."

Christianity suffers for all this; it *must* suffer. We must be prepared for failures; we must be prepared for the confounding together by the heathen of the works of all the associations I have referred to, whether within or without the Church, and for their imputation of the faults of each to all; while the Romanists, who class us all alike as schismatic sects, are but too glad to attribute the failures of any portion of them to a general withholding of God's blessing from any missionary labours thus undertaken, and thus directed. Can any of us doubt that God regards with anger and displeasure our dissensions and schisms, and that these form the chief obstacle to the extension of His kingdom?

We are too apt to think of our missions as being sent to ignorant and benighted heathens. In India this is not the case, for though ignorant of the *true religion*, they are far from being uncivilized, and many, very many, Mahometans and Hindoos are well educated men. Now to such as these we must present ourselves, not as giving an uncertain sound, but as fully convinced of the truth of our teaching; we must be models in discipline of our own doctrinal theory. We have seen the aspect in which the Church must have presented itself in *doctrine* to such men; let us see how they must have viewed it with respect to *discipline*.

At the time when our multifarious Societies began to disseminate

their multifarious doctrines, not only were incessant wars devastating every Province, not only were Christians apparently living unaffected by religious discipline and principles, not only was the Church of Christ unseen in any visible form, but Christian Governments denounced Christianity. Laws passed by Englishmen rendered converts to Christianity incapable of holding offices as civilians, and the good Bishop Heber relates that a corporal in the then company's service was removed from it for having embraced Christianity. I have read, too, that the first Indian Bishop was inducted into his spiritual domain by stealth, through a faithless fear of offending heathen prejudices.

What said Sir Herbert Edwardes on this subject and its bearing on the Indian mutiny, at a meeting of the Church Missionary Society in England eight years ago: "The Indian mutiny was not caused by trying to disseminate Christianity: it was caused, I tell you on the word of a spectator, on the word of a participator in those events—by our keeping back Christianity from the people; it was caused not by a knowledge of Christianity, but by an utter ignorance of what it is. Our government in India had systematically kept the knowledge of Christianity from its native army. When by chance one solitary native soldier in the Bengal Provinces was converted to Christianity, that instant he became in the estimation of the Government unfit to stand in the ranks of the army; that instant, by virtue, or rather by vice, of his being a Christian, he was expelled. What, then, was the result of this policy pursued through a hundred years? The Sepoy, ignorant of what Christianity was, judged it by the light which he had within, which was darkness. He supposed it was a thing he could catch like a disease by touching some Christian person or substance. The Enfield cartridge made up, as they supposed, with beeves' fat or pigs' fat was to their ideas the very embodiment of a converting scheme. This was, in their estimation, the happiest device that any Government could have hit on. They did not blame the Government in their hearts for wishing to convert them to Christianity: they thought that it was the most natural thing for a Government to attempt. Religion is to the native a reality. It is the thread of his life. All his daily acts are beads strung upon this string. His festivals, his feasts, his fasts, his ceremonies, his domestic events all enter into his religion, and his religion enters into them. The native is nothing without his religion; it is the back bone of his existence. He cannot therefore understand a Government ignoring religion."

Under such an aspect was the missionary's work to be presented to the Indian people! To the very same purport is later

intelligence from China. Our minister even now will not tolerate the presence of a Protestant Missionary at Peking. The only one whom the Bishop of Hong Kong was able to leave on the occasion of a visit he made a few years ago to the Celestial capital, would appear to have been accredited there only *as a teacher of the English language!* Why is it that more toleration is shown in that capital to Roman than to English Catholics? May it not be that the French Government throw themselves heartily into the work of pushing forward and supporting the mission of their Church and faith. Already their converts in Peking amount to over two thousand, and a large elegant Cathedral is completed in *one* part of the city, whilst in another a smaller Church has been some time built. *We* have no house of prayer yet, and our only missionary is a *smuggled one*. Remember moreover such facts as these: when Carey, the Baptist Missionary, went out first to India to preach the word of God, he was forced to betake himself to the Danish settlement of Serampore, because the English were afraid of having the missionary to the heathen settle in their territory. Again, Sir Peregrine Maitland was compelled to return to England, leaving a high official post, returning in disgrace, and *so far as man's orders could make it*, a dishonored man, because he refused to order Christian English soldiers to fire salutes for the most accursed of the Hindoo idols! "The element of Christianity," says a writer on the subject, "was in India entirely suppressed, and our administration presented the spectacle of one of the greatest Christian powers in the world sedulously bent upon ignoring its own belief."

How would all this appear from the point of view in which the Mahometans, and the Hindoos, or even the Chinese would see it? The Mahometan is a strict observer of his religious duties, as those duties are taught him. Never does the sun rise or set on him, but, having performed all his ablutions, having, as he would say, washed his hands in innocency, and spread his carpet to keep him from the pollutions of this sinful earth, he kneels down and repeats his prayers. And this is done secretly or openly, wherever he may happen to be at the time. I have seen it carried out with the most wrapt but unobtrusive devotion on the crowded and busy decks of a steamer. With him almsgiving is a set and regular duty, scrupulously, though perhaps formally, performed. Fasting with him is regular and severe; terribly so I remember to have thought it when I first visited Turkey in their Ramazan, or Lent season. When the Mahometan enters his mosque, his shoes are carefully put off at the door. So must yours if you would not be hastily driven out again, as I saw some free and independent citizens of the neighboring Republic driven from St. Sophia some

fifteen years ago. Provided with Firmans from our respective Ambassadors at Constantinople, eight or ten American ladies and gentlemen and myself presented ourselves for entrance at the mosque of St. Sophia. We were directed to remove our boots and replace them by slippers, provided for the purpose. I obeyed, and urged my companions to do so also, but they refused, and persisted, against the remonstrances of the attendants, in making their way into the mosque, which at the time was occupied by many worshippers. At length the wrath of these attendants became so great that the party were forcibly driven from the building, pushed down the steps which led from it, and actually whipped as they fled along the street.

It was some consolation to the outraged feelings of my American companions that, altho' the unoffending member of the party, the British officer fared worst on the occasion. For, not having time to resume the use of my own boots, and being encumbered with the loose Turkish slipper, I made but slow progress, and may be said to have formed the rear guard, and so to have covered the undignified retreat of the whole party.

Thus the Mahometan acknowledges that the place where he is treading is holy ground, and when in, he creeps silently and reverently to his place, where, as before, he kneels upon his carpet. Now what can we say to such a man as that? He will admit that he believes in Christ, that they—the Mahometans—had been Christians once, “but,” says he, “we had fallen into those bad habits in which you Christians continue to this day, and so God sent us another Prophet, Mahomet, to bring us back to the pure religion. Look at your people—they never pray, they never fast. Some give alms certainly, but not all: it is evidently, therefore, not *a part of* your religion. It was in Christ's time, but you have forgotten it, and as for your places of worship—*supposing he had* ever seen a church—they are not places of worship at all. They are places occasionally open where people hear lectures, but not where men go to kneel, and pray, as we do.” This is supposing he had ever seen a church, but most likely he never would have seen one. For many years there was not a church in India, and even yet there are but few. The Christians who were to set an example to the nations had not enough of religion to worship their God once a week, instead of the every day of the Mahometans. In vain would the missionary talk of the pure religion and its strict requirements! The Mahometan judged *not* by what he *heard*—for he heard so many different versions—but by what he *saw*! There was no visible representative Church: there was no band of holy men actually doing what the preacher said God's law required. English troops were pushed far into the country, but, till lately, they carried not God's Minister along with them. Sir

Charles Napier, when commanding in Scinde, sent home his solemn protest against the absence of ministers of the religion of England in the force and Province committed to his government.

"One Catholic Church!" There was *not a Church*. There were Men's Societies. There was the difference between Augustine's mission, and our Indian missions! With the Hindoo the case was still more difficult. He worshipped, indeed, a multitude of idols, but still he would answer that there was but one God, and that his idols were but reminders of that God's perfections. The very essence of Hindooism is self-denial, as indeed in theory it is of Christianity. In the Hindoo it is mixed up with all sorts of impieties and absurdities, as might be expected in men who have not the spirit of Christ to guide them; but there it is, and they act up to it. They will sacrifice anything—their riches, their children, their very lives—to their sense of duty to God: monstrous as that idea sometimes is in practice. But this is the essence of the Christian religion also—at least we profess that it is. The missionary preaches it as he is bound; but the Hindoo replies: "Look at us, and look at yourselves; whose religion is true, judging by the earnestness of its followers? Look at us in our holy pilgrimages over the hot plains of Hindostan; look at us giving up our children to the holy Ganges; look at us leaving all, counting our lives as nothing in the service of our God, and look at yourselves. You count your lives as nothing: you leave your homes and your friends as well as we, but it is in the pursuit of pleasure, whenever it is not in the pursuit of gain."

We say that our justice and our righteousness, and our great superiority to the Indian in everything which relates to truth, are the fruits of our religion, and so they are; but they are not the fruits of Indian religion, and we cannot trace them to it. Self-denial, and worship, and purity of life, ought to be the fruits of it too, and these the Indian would appreciate, but he cannot understand a religion without discipline. In such matters the visible Church is invisible to him.

Now this description is not the whole truth, and I know that the Christian would have a great deal more to say for himself, but I think it is the truth as it would strike the mind of a Hindoo. And upon all this comes the miscellaneous teaching of our unconnected societies, and which is he to believe? Unitarian, Presbyterian, Baptist, Wesleyan, Independent, Church of England—all these are Christian and Protestant—which is to be his instructor? "That they *all* may be one," said our Lord and Master, "as Thou Father art in Me and I in Thee: that they may be one in us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." We, the professed disciples of Christ are not one in Christ, and *therefore it is* that we preach Him in vain.

“See how these Christians love one another,” was the heathen’s remark in the early days of the Church. Alas! what bitter irony would such expression carry with it now. If St. Augustine and St. Anskar had had to labor against such difficulty as this, we might have been worshipping Thor and Odin to this day!

Necessary as a visible Church upon Earth is, for those who have been brought up all their lives in the laws and obligations of that Church, much more is it necessary for those who have still to learn them, and who have no means whatever of arriving at the knowledge of a spiritual ruler except by studying from sight and practice his spiritual rules affecting the lives, and daily conduct, and practice of his followers. If then the difficulties which have hindered the spreading of Christianity in India, or elsewhere, lie at our door, then are they those which every one of us may help to accumulate, or may help to diminish. Those difficulties mainly have been the apathy of the Church, our sinful schisms from the Church, and our no less sinful divisions *in* the Church,—the backwardness of the country to stand, as Colonel Edwardes says, “*Avowedly* as a Christian Government,” and our own prayerless lives. Surely by these things have we shut up the kingdom of God from the heathen. Those who have stood wrangling at the gate entered not in themselves, but, what was worse than that, them that would enter in they hindered. The blessed Sun of Christ’s Church would have shone upon the lands which He gave us for a possession, but our own half-heartedness raised the mist between it and the land it was shining on. And yet, in spite of all these things *some* portion of success has been given to us. If missions have not prospered as they should, they have not been altogether fruitless. Now in Central Africa, at the Cape, at Sierra Leone, and amongst the Sandwich Islands, is the good work making a progress, and in a way it did not before. A mission, too, in its primitive integrity, is in contemplation for Madagascar.

Some of the minor obstacles, at which I have previously glanced, would appear to be already giving way in India, but before our superior education, energy, and civilization, not our direct missionary effort, or peculiarly Christian character. From all accounts caste has little chance of maintaining itself against railway influences. The papers tell us of all castes being huddled together in one carriage, and in long journeys having to eat their food side by side. They also tell us of the native landed proprietors of Oude having themselves taken in hand the suppression of infanticide. From the constant travelling generated by railways, sacred places cannot long remain sacred. Already, immense lengths of rail are open, and—even if other agencies be not at work—a great revolution of mind and feeling impends from this cause alone.

Can we long remain insensible of how deep interest to ourselves is the religious welfare of over one hundred and seventy millions of fellow-subjects united under the same crown? If our people at large are insensible of this, it must be from not having kept in mind what India may be to us, in numbers, if in nothing else—for *evil*, if not for *good*! “Between us and the people of India,” says Sir Herbert Edwardes, “the great want is the want of a link. We are divided by our religions. We stand aloof—the heathen on the one side, and the Christian on the other—and find nothing in our worldly policy to bridge the space. We shall,” adds that able soldier and good man, “only find that link in Christianity.”

A new era has been born to us in 1857, and it is useless to try and return to the old order of things. Surely the result of that mutiny, in which, had not the people sided with us, they might, from their numbers, have “smothered us with their very turbans,” is enough to assure us that we are still permitted to bear the sacred burthen—that our country may yet be the means of evangelizing the great continent of India. Brought as we were within one step of ruin, we have had re-consigned to our charge well nigh 200,000,000 of people.

But our more immediate duty lies before us in the continent on which our lot is cast. We find it in making earlier and better provision for furthering, through our Diocesan Church Societies, the work of missions in the remoter parts of these Provinces, in establishing on a more permanent basis and augmenting the pittance of our missionary clergy, and in increasing their numbers. This is plainly the first and most urgent call upon us, and it is one which—if met effectually—must be met by a regularly-sustained, and well kept up effort. To give this year, and to withhold the next, will do but little good. Our duty in this matter is surely, however, not confined to ourselves; it is to speed the good work across that portion of the continent committed to our charge. Great on all sides would be the blessings which would flow from sacrifices for such a purpose; for is it not an universal law that in blessing others, we are ourselves blest? As the planting of a vigorous colony strengthens by a reflex action the nation from which it springs, so, in widened communion, in the fuller assertion of her principles, and in blessings on her individual members, does missionary work the Church from which it springs.

And the great country on which we border is not behindhand; for, see with what abounding zeal and energy does our sister Church in the States now press onward the good work. I know few things more interesting than the tidings which reach us of the spirit which animates, and of the progress which attends her. I know nothing grander or more ennobling than those blessed shoots

of a loving charity which that Church put forth—from North and from South—at the general Convention three years ago, just as the war had terminated. And did not our own hearts kindle as we read the words of Catholic greeting, on that occasion, to the good Metropolitan of Canada—now gone to his rest,—and to the Prolocutor of the Provincial Synod? As I write, two of the Clergy of this Diocese—one a veteran in the ranks of the Church—are attending the general Convention now in session at New York. We may feel sure they will return gladdened by the welcome they will have met from their American brethren, and strengthened by all they will have seen and heard of the good work being done—not alone in the East and Centre, but in the far West of the United States.

Let us remember that we, too, like that sister Church, have remote settlements calling for reversion of past neglect, and yearning for our missionary help; that we, too, have a continent to span, and must send forth men and means for the mighty work before us. Shall we not, in responding to the cry for urgent temporal want, which comes to us from the Red River Territory, give them that, and *more* than that. The Bishop of Rupert's Land has been pleading in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, for the spiritual needs of his vast Diocese; he seeks to establish a college there for giving a proper missionary education to the young men who come amongst them. Having myself heard his Lordship's earnest cry for help on the occasion of a late visit to Montreal, I would fain urge it in this Province, whither he has been unable to come. He looks forward to the time when the outposts of the missionary army of the Dominion of Canada shall meet his, and pursue together their onward course to the West. May it be that the spirit of our God, which of old woke up Apostles and Evangelists, may be so breathed out in this our day, that there shall be no lack of men saying, "Here am I—send me;" of labourers who, as the Master calls them, shall go forth into His field, reapers-in of the greatness of the harvest. Only let us be true to ourselves, and the principles handed down to us through successive ages from the earliest and mightiest days of the Church's teaching, and hallowed by the truest missionary success. It is with the Church among ourselves in this country, as with the Church in Southern Africa, in New South Wales, and in New Zealand; it must re-learn to go alone, and not to wait on the slow movements, the tardy aid, and often jealous co-operation—if not actual opposition—of earthly powers.

Let us remember (it will lift us up to noble purpose, and real achievement if we do,) that it is not when she has fullest coffers, and most abundant revenues, when the world most smiles upon her, when her ritual is the most gorgeous, and her power seems at

its height, that the Church is most surely doing her Lord's work in the world.

We may here call to mind the incident of one of the Popes, on being visited by a holy man to whom he was shewing the glories of the Vatican. "You see," said the Pope, "St. Peter cannot now say 'silver and gold have I none.'" "Neither can he say," was the reply, "Rise up and walk."

Is it not well, especially at the present time in reference to Ireland, to remember that endowments, however convenient when possessed, are not of the essence of the Church, and in connection with such fact, is it not also well to keep before our minds the further fact that in ecclesiastical, as in civil affairs, individuals cannot be absolved from the duty of providing for and maintaining the body to which they belong—such duty is liable to be lost sight of when for a length of time it has been left to the inanimate agency of tithes on land.

The Church ever most truly fulfils her divine commission when, through the dark places of the earth, by means of her missionary ministry, "the poor have the Gospel preached to them." Then is the Church not an abstraction, or an idea, but a *living thing*; and one great test of her vitality will be the presence of that spirit of expansion which lives in the very charter under which she acts, and which animates her ministers and her laity as far as in them lies, to feel that they are "debtors both to the Greeks and to the barbarians, both to the wise and to the unwise, to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ." Shall we not then rouse ourselves and our neighbors anew to take a greater interest in the true and full development of our faith and missionary work? Let us realize more the immense importance of *individual* energy in the cause; each one must make such work his own personal concern, bringing home to himself his responsibility to do something in it, and doing it in love. Let us remember how and why we suffered a century ago, when good John Wesley and his twenty-nine thousand followers—who alone in evil days had the courage to arouse a sleeping Church, and to preach its forgotten obligation—were persecuted, and at last lost to our communion. Alas! in his generation diligence and earnestness found little room within the Church's fold. In our days Wesley would have been a laborious and earnest Churchman. Let us remember, too, how, later still, hundreds of earnest, energetic, evangelical men, who loved the Church, were driven from it to swell the ranks of Protestant dissent, chiefly because they were in earnest in crying out against the mere morality of those times. And how, yet later, men of holy lives and earnest purpose, who pointed sternly to forgotten duties, and discipline neglected, have been persecuted and abused. How men, who were conscious that they had a trust

committed to them, and would preserve it intact,—who, belonging to the Church of England, showed that they belonged to it by relaxing nothing of all that it required, have been suspected and spoken against, and some of them, it may be, driven from the Church they would and should have served.

How invariably has it happened that those who have done good to the Church,—those who founded it,—those who repaired and restored its breaches,—have been for a time unpopular. In after ages, when we have reaped the fruits of their labours, and self-denials, we honor them, but in their lifetime it has been far otherwise. We have seen how Wesley was persecuted and his followers stigmatized—as earnest men still often are—as “Methodists!” Again, how did party clamour seek to drown the voice of truth and earnestness in such men as Venn, and Simeon, and Wilberforce, and call them “Evangelicals!” And in our own times how have Church reformers been persecuted, and ridiculed, and spoken against as “High Churchmen,” “Tractarians,” “Puseyites!” Let the following instance illustrate and answer this matter. The story is well-known, but it will bear repetition: A stage-coach was starting from a certain place in England. Its only inside passenger was a worthy, comely, well-intentioned dame. Just before the coach drove out of the inn yard, the guard opened the door, and a quiet, parson-like, middle-aged gentleman, with a benevolent smile, took his place beside her. Before they had arrived at their respective destinations, the parties in question had had time for a good deal of conversation. Being each prepossessed with the other’s appearance and sentiments, they had formed what might be called a stage-coach intimacy. The lady talked much, as ladies of that age are apt to do, of the wickedness of the times; “and then those Puseyites,” said she, “those wicked, Popish Puseyites, they are worse than all put together; what ever shall we come to?” “Puseyites, ma’am,” said the gentleman, “what are they, and what wickedness do they commit?” “Is it possible, sir,” said the lady, “that you have never heard of those Puseyites, they are turning the world upside down?” The gentleman admitted that he had heard of such people, but that he did not know a great deal about them, and as for turning the world upside down, the lady had just admitted that she did not see much good in the side which was now uppermost. “Do you know,” said she confidentially, speaking in a low solemn voice, and laying her hand upon his shoulder, “do you know that Dr. Pusey himself sacrifices a lamb every Friday?” “Nonsense, my dear madam,” said the gentleman, “I assure you he does no such thing.” “I don’t know what you mean by nonsense, sir,” said the lady, drawing herself up, and speaking with becoming dignity, “I

suppose you do not mean to doubt my word ; and I assure you I have it from the best authority—Dr. Pusey sacrifices a lamb every Friday!" "But madam, my dear madam," said he deprecatingly, "I am Dr. Pusey, and I never sacrificed a lamb in my life. I have not the heart to do it, and I don't know how to do it either."

Remembering such things, and how easy it is to fall into a harsh and unfair judgment, let us do all that in us lies to eschew divisions amongst ourselves, and let us hope and pray that the dissent we so much mourn may yet be healed. Even now we are being permitted to see the dawn of a brighter day for the Church of England, and it may be of an enlarged return to her communion.

Which of us but must have been struck by the yearning for a long time known to have been felt by some, but now openly avowed by many, of the clergy and laity of the Established Church of Scotland towards a much closer approximation to our Book of Common Prayer?

I took the following extract a short time ago from a Scotch paper: "In the Canongate, Edinburgh, a document was read on Sunday, giving the unanimous opinion of the Kirk Session in favour of standing during the singing, and kneeling during prayers, in public worship. Both the ministers approve of the change."

And is there not a more marked significance than perhaps at first occurs to the mind in the fact that the sons of four of the late Presidents of the Wesleyan Methodist body at home are at this time ministers of the Church of England?

I read a statement in the Colonial Church Chronicle, taken from a Church Review, published in "the States," to the effect that within—I think—one year nine ministers of the Baptist, Methodist, or Presbyterian denominations had been admitted to holy orders in our church, whilst of fifty-five persons confirmed in Emmanuel Church, Boston, on one occasion within the same year forty-seven were from other denominations!

I observe, too, that it was stated by the Bishop of Rhode Island, during a recent visit to England, that five out of every six of the present clergy of the Episcopal Church in the United States had come from other quarters, not having been born or brought up in that Church.

Again, "in not a few places," said the Bishop of New York, in addressing the Convention of his Diocese last month, (September, 1868,) "half of the candidates whom I confirm have come from other religious bodies within a few years, and they have come, in a large proportion of cases, with a real love for the Church's ways, and a full acceptance of her principles. "The Church grows," adds the Bishop, "and people from without are flocking to her courts like doves to their windows."

Many years ago it was said by a devoted adherent of the Roman Catholic Church "that if ever Christians should re-unite it would seem that the movement must take its rise in the Anglican Communion," and Bishop Williams, of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the States, observes that "it has occurred to more than one thoughtful mind in our day that, if ever this re-union—the fulfilment of Our Saviour's latest prayer—shall come, it must be on the basis of Polity, Ritual and Doctrine, on which Christianity stood before diversities grew up."

May it not be then that our reformed Church, holding, as it does, the primitive ways—Evangelical truth with Apostolic order, and inheriting by an indisputable succession from those on whom the Great Master breathed His power, the transmitted authority of His undying Apostleship—is being made the "preparing type for the Church of the latter days." If it be a dream to hope so, at least let us remember it will not make us dreamers to live, and pray as if it were indeed to be so. "Oh," said the Dean of Cork, now Bishop of Peterborough, in a sermon preached last month in St. Patrick's Cathedral, in Dublin, "Oh, if Christendom were one, but for a single hour, what force could stand before it?"

We have, as a Church, in our missionary labors, a large inheritance of past neglect to be reversed, and, God be thanked, we are not without many signs of healthier life. The need of men fitted for the work by education, and training, and willing to go forth, would seem at this time the greatest want. Would that there were more, far more, of the sons of these Provinces preparing for the Church's work, and ready to venture their all on the great deep of God's providence. And difficult as may be, and as is the venture of all missionary work, it must be borne in mind that it is less so *now* than ever before. Time was, when he who would go forth, must do so in the weakness of a single, solitary course. Now it is not so; for—look where we may—the seats of Apostolic rule and strength are fixed, or being fixed for us. England's sons and the sons of this great Dominion freely go forth to fill up her armies and navies, or to administer her most distant settlements: and shall the Church lack sons to do her part, and win, against the coming day, her crowns of victory? Circumstanced as we are now, it would not seem possible to discharge our duty in this work except through the agency of Church Societies, and it is of great use that, over and above the regular working of such societies, there should be efforts of a more special kind—such as the sermons at the late meeting of the Diocesan Synod in this city, and meetings throughout the country—to arouse to greater energy and stronger purpose the missionary work of the Church. Does there not seem a danger lest our broad Catholic Episcopacy should dwindle into the narrowness of congregational action, each congre-

gation standing aloof, and alone, as though no other Parish existed, instead of presenting the sublime spectacle of a solid phalanx? Our hearts are not bound together as they should be.

When we calmly survey the field of missionary labor before us on this Continent, its vastness and extent, and the issues involved, we shall see that it is a work calling for united effort in the sweetest and strongest spirit of unity. Let us of the Anglican communion everywhere draw closer our bands of brotherhood. Isolation is indeed the bane of any Parish, or Diocese. "Great will be the blessing," observed the Metropolitan of South Africa, on a late occasion in England, "on the distant Churches of the Empire connecting themselves with each other, and with the Mother Church, as they will do, by spiritual ties enacted in Synods. The Diocesan allying itself with the Provincial, the Provincial with the National or (as hereafter, our Synods may include more nations than one) the General, the General with the Œcumenical. Only," adds Bishop Gray, "let this principle of connection and subordination be generally recognised, and we shall have adopted a system which has stood the test of ages, which was the recognised system of the Church from primitive times to the great division of East and West, and which would—had it been adhered to—have preserved Christendom to this day in unity."

And every such meeting of the members of the Church serves to keep us from falling into the groove of mere routine, to assert her own missionary spirit, and by a reflex influence to warm and invigorate our own hearts. It is the neglect to claim with the full wholeness of a perfect faith the sure promises of our God which weakens missionary work, and thins the ranks of our missionary army.

Oh, for some Francis Xavier to arise in our Church, and to show us what may be done by one giant soul acting under the inspiration of a great faith and a great love! Here was a man—Roman Catholic though he was—penetrated with the conviction of what he had to do, and doing it with a might which will live to all ages, the astonishment of the world. If any will read a book, published not long since by a clergyman in Ireland, called "Praying and Working," they will there see what is being, and what has been, done by missionary labour in Germany, and amongst the heathen, in this century, by men in earnest in a good cause. Wherever, in any age, or Church, or country, this spirit is wanting, all true service is wanting too.

To this level the unsympathising world at large is ever working to bring down the tone of God's servants; the missionary spirit seems to the worldly-wise so unpractical, so fanatical, so exaggerated! Against such, then, within herself, must the Church be ever struggling, and ever renewing by missionary effort her esti-

mate of the blessedness of ministering to the lost. Look where you may along the past, and never will you find her breaking forth into missionary ministries of love, and not find her also receiving back into herself, in larger volume, the blessings of her Lord. Such effort does indeed bless and revive the body out of which it springs.

Against questioning unbelief, and speculation on God's Word—with which our time is so sadly conversant—missionary work may prove both a protest and a safeguard. It may serve, too, to abate our party spirit, to loose the hard knot which discord has tied, and to show how strong is the Spirit's life in our branch of Christ's Church.

Oh, as we think of the magnitude of the work of Church Missions—of the blessings which they are the means of bearing forth, let us take a more real hearty share in it, and renew our interest in it, and our labours for it.

As my previous remarks have been almost confined to the work of missions to the heathen, and in our own colonies, a few words with respect to the movement now going on in the Church of Italy may, I think, prove of interest to all. And since many have not opportunities of hearing or reading much about it, I venture to give some extracts from authentic sources, which have lately come under my notice.

Some zealous Protestant communities have endeavored to take advantage of the present circumstances of Italy for the propagation of their own opinions. The Vaudois have established congregations in Turin, Florence, &c., and Britain has furnished missionaries from the Plymouth Brethren and the Free Kirk of Scotland. It would not, however, seem that their systems are at all likely to attract the great mass of such a people as the Italians.

There is reason, indeed, to fear that harm has already been done in Italy by the proceedings of unwise propagandists. Dr. Wordsworth, in his journal of a tour in Italy, published a few years ago, tells us, for instance, of an English clergyman who went to Rome to circulate tracts among the Bishops assembled for the Japanese Canonization. He was treated with much forbearance by the Roman authorities, who sent him quietly away, paid the rent of his lodgings, and gave him compensation for his confiscated tracts. While we give all due credit to the benevolent intentions and zeal of persons engaged in such like attempts, it may be questioned whether the result of these irregular exertions can be regarded as in any way good. It is stated in a late number of "The American Church Review," that "some excellent persons, whose feelings and

expectations were all the other way, have been convinced by experience of the impracticability of securing general or permanent reformation in Italy on the principle of an entire rejection of every feature of their former church."

We read that a distinguished Italian layman told Canon Wordsworth, at Turin, that his countrymen are influenced by national pride to such a degree that they imagine that there is scarcely anything good which is not of Italian growth; that Italy has no need of learning from any other country, but has a prescriptive right, even from the time of her Ciceros and Virgils, to be the teacher of the world. Therefore, the course of all wise reformers will be to show the people of Italy that genuine reformation is a *restoration* of Italian Church polity; and then there is some hope that it may be accepted—but not otherwise.

No one can read what has been going on of late in Italy without being convinced, I think, that much has not been done towards breaking the ties which bind that nation to the history of the past, and to the Communion of the Church of Rome. But many books lately published tend to show that much has been done in making the principles of our Church known to Italians, and above all to such of the Italian clergy as are willing to receive information.

It may be interesting to some to know that a society, called the "Anglo-Continental Society," has been labouring for a few years past to promote the translation and circulation of such works as are suited to give a more correct idea of the doctrine and practice of the Church of England. The purpose of its operation is declared to be, "to raise up a spirit of reform within the bosom of the Italian Church, which may eventuate in a national reform of the whole Church of Italy, carried out by the authorities in State and Church: not to establish a new Church nor to draw individuals out of the Italian Church into separate communities, but to help forward the internal reformation of the Italian Church by the instructed mind of the Church."

As the Reformation in England was a great necessity, we can never renounce the principles which led to it, nor can we draw nigh to other Christians by any softening down of differences which would involve a departure from first principles. We may, however, by such a society as this, in view of the restlessness and unsettlement so apparent at this time in Italy—might we not include Spain?—present its people with a true picture of our own position. We may show them that we were *once*, what they are *now*, and that we have come out of the struggle a Christian Church, a catholic Church, but a reformed Church, founded on the Holy Scriptures, that they may be encouraged to follow our example.

The "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge," has also given powerful aid towards the object of making known the principles of our Church, by publishing an Italian translation of the Prayer Book, and by liberally supplying copies of this for distribution, or for sale at a low price. "During last winter," observes a correspondent of Dr. Wordsworth, "I could not but feel thankful to see that the seed thus sown was, in several instances, manifestly yielding good fruit, in increase of sympathy with the reformed Episcopal Church, in the removal of misapprehensions, and in the formation of a desire for analogous reforms in the Church of Italy." The same writer tells of the effect on a parish priest near Naples, with whom he was acquainted. "Last year he was greatly interested in our Prayer Book, and in 'Jewell's Apology.' *This* year I was thankful to find in his case, as in others, that increased knowledge of the real character of the Reformed Episcopal Church, manifestly led to increased sympathy with us, and desire for analogous reforms in the Church of Italy. He gladly joined with us in short morning and evening prayers, in which the Italian version of our Prayer Book happily enabled us to unite, reading alternately the Psalms for the day, with a lesson and a portion of the prayers. He said afterwards, If we could but have our Church services in our own tongue, and could have this intelligible reading of the Psalms by priests and people, and the Scriptures read out in our own tongue, in the reverent way that seems habitual to English Church people, the face of things would be wholly changed in our churches. Now unhappily our people too often come in chatting and laughing, not heeding the service; and when we complain they say, 'It is in Latin, and we cannot understand it.'" (As I write the telegram indicates that the spirit of reform would seem to be already at work in this matter.)

Again, Count Taska, an Italian nobleman, spoke as follows to Dr. Wordsworth: "I lent a copy of the Prayer Book to a priest, who used to rail at England as a land of schismatics, heretics, and infidels; and he confessed to me that the Litany in that book was the most beautiful form of prayer he had ever seen.

After the battles of Magenta and Solferino, I was entrusted with the superintendence of the Military Hospitals. I translated many of the collects and prayers of the English Prayer Book into various languages, and put them into the hands of the soldiers on their sick beds. Almost all accepted and used them, and expressed the great comfort they found in them. Some of the Roman Catholic clergy and Bishops who visited the hospitals were delighted with them, and I was warmly thanked for what I had done. At last, however, it was discovered that they were translated from the English Prayer

Book, and then one of the bishops in my neighbourhood denounced them as heretical." Father Felix, a Sicilian priest, writes: "It is indeed a great pity that the real principles and true doctrines of the Church of England are so little known to the communions which differ from her. A fair statement of her doctrines would confer an immense benefit on her sister churches on the Continent."

We read again that an English clergyman who visited, in last Lent, the Benedictines of Monte Casino, found several of the fathers interested about our Prayer Book. They came more than once to talk to him about it; and at their request he left his copy with them. Before leaving he asked one of them if he thought his and our branches of the Church would ever be re-united? "Yes, I do," replied the Benedictine, "though neither you nor I will live to see that day; but meantime remember that what you of the Church of England can best do to promote re-union of the Church, is, not to join us, but to help us in our attempts to purify ourselves."

More or less of the spirit of this last remark, seems to run through all the works of a number of Italian gentlemen which I have seen reviewed, and extracted from. They protest strongly against leaving their church, but they are scarcely less strong for more or less reformation in it. It seems worth while to cite here a recent case in which, although the scene was in the heart of India, the actor and narrator was by birth a Neapolitan subject, and therefore one whose evidence may be specially valuable as to the best way of approaching the case and state of Italy. Father Felix, a Sicilian capuchin, having gone to India as a missionary, with the usual prejudices of his country and his class against Protestantism of every kind, found himself disturbed by the papal decree in favor of the Immaculate Conception, for, although he held this doctrine as a matter of opinion, he was startled at its being erected into an article of necessary faith. After much uneasiness he asked the English chaplain at the station where he was, to lend him some books on the controversy between the churches, and received from him Jeremy Taylor's "Dissuasive from Popery," and Professor Harold Brown's "Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles." "When I went home," he writes, "I felt a kind of uneasiness in opening the books; however, I prayed to God for light, and took in hand Jeremy Taylor. The very title-page indisposed me; I felt it was too bad to call my religion 'Popery,' and read it with suspicion. I went on reading, but I found that there was generally in it a kind of misrepresentation—I should say exaggeration—of some points of the Roman doctrines; and I felt that it was not fair to charge the adversary with consequences drawn from an exaggeration of his principles. So I stopped

reading, and would have thrown away the book had it been my own. I thought that nothing could be derived from reading Protestant books; for I said, 'truth has no need of misrepresentation,' and I regretted having asked for the books at all. But, after two days, happening to open Professor Brown's work, and to read a portion, I find him so fair in representing the doctrines of the Roman Church, so faithful and guarded in his expressions, remaining a step behind rather than in advance of the truth, that it conciliated my mind and my heart. What was more, I found each point strengthened by the authority of the Fathers."

This, which was contrary to all his expectations, raised the suspicion that the patristic quotations might have been falsified; but at Agra Father Felix found the means of satisfying himself on this head, and after a time—having on full conviction made up his mind to leave the Roman Church—he was received into communion by the Bishop of Calcutta, and is now a Missionary of our own Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. The effect of the two styles of controversy on his mind (not that Bishop Taylor is at all to be classed with the extreme opponents of Rome) may read a lesson to all who take part in the discussions of religious questions.

As members of an ancient and Catholic, yet purified and reformed branch of the Church, which, through God's grace, has for ages happily combined the fullest and freest setting forth of the Bible as the rule of faith and life, ought we not to try and show to others (situated in many respects as our forefathers were) the way we have found it good to follow, as an example which may encourage them, if, in God's providence, they may be led to some similar internal reformation in accordance with their own national temperament and circumstances?

As the latest authentic intelligence on this important subject is contained in the official preliminary report of the Rev. Mr. Langdon, to the Italian Committee of the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States—of which Committee the Bishop of Maryland is Chairman—the following account is given from the concluding portion of that report. It is so candidly and impartially recorded, and opens out the whole case of the present movement in the Italian Church so fully, that it enables each one to form a pretty accurate idea of the merits of that movement up to the middle of the present year. Mr. Langdon dates from Florence, 4th July, 1868:—

If pass now to speak of those ecclesiastics, whom I have assigned to the first class, who retaining their positions, retain thus the power, when the time is ripe, to take active practical measures for the accomplishment of a reformation in the Church.

Of these men I can of course only speak in general terms ; but when I consider how slowly their views of the nature of needed reform are developing, and the great necessity of caution on their part, I deem myself fortunate to be able to speak of them at all with any certainty.

As a class no such line of demarkation can be drawn between them and other liberal clergy, as would enable me to make any definite estimate of its numbers. It is a question of degree, shading off from the most advanced reformers, to those who vaguely and ignorantly yearn for something better than the present state of things, and who would not yet so much as look at the *Esaminatore*. This journal is sent direct to about 600 priests, besides a probably larger number of school teachers, other laymen, lyceums, libraries, journals, &c. Several priests who received it last year have indeed withdrawn their names, either on account of want of sympathy with its advancing views, on account of the Papal condemnation and Episcopal warnings, or on account of the increase of price ; but on the other hand, as I was assured by an eminent ecclesiastic, "Many who, a year ago, threw the *Esaminatore* contemptuously behind them, now read it with real pleasure." The number of copies received by priests is, however, a poor basis for an estimate ; for many take it in secret, while in other cases a single number is regularly read by several besides the receiver. One Monsignore told me that *ten* priests came weekly to his room to read his copy. And moreover, the number taken respectively in different Dioceses depends as much upon the danger of persecution in consequence, as upon the number of those in sympathy with its teachings. Still, so far as we can judge from so imperfect a criterion, the circulation of the *Esaminatore* indicates that by far the most widespread interest in Reform is felt in Lombardy and Venetia, but in the former to double the extent shown in the latter. The same test proves that the interest for Reform is, next to these, far more widely spread among the priests in the province of Naples than in any other part of Italy. Even Piedmont, which comes next, does not receive one-fourth the number, nor Tuscany one-sixth, while the smallest subscription list is that of the late Papal States. This fact concerning Naples, I should say in passing, proves the existence of Reform elements, of which I know but little more than that they are wholly distinct and separate from the Emancipation Society or the suspended priests, of whom I have heretofore reported.

The reforming priests belong to every class, though they are chiefly found among the more intelligent and cultivated *Prevosti* and *Parrochi*, in and near the larger cathedral cities and towns. Death frees these men from the fear of bitter persecution of the Curia Romana ; and it may serve to suggest what class of men are yet enlisted in this cause, if I name the losses with which it has met within a year past. Cavalier *Andrea Merini*, Prevosto of one of the leading churches in Milan and Senator of the kingdom, was among the *Esaminatore's* most devoted supporters. Monsignore *Bignani*, one of the Major Canons of the cathedral in the same capital, a learned man of high-toned religious principle and wide influence, was also in earnest in this cause. Prevosto *Barzachine*, of a parish some fifteen miles from Florence, was Dr. Bianciardi's most intimate friend, and his chief aid in the preparation of his History of the Popes, and a frequent contributor to the *Esaminatore*, over the signature DALVELO. These able, godly, and devoted men have been taken, not from the *leadership* of the Reform school, but from among many other ecclesiastics, their peers in every way.

During my last tour in Lombardo-Venetia I had the privilege of meeting and conferring, in more or less unreserved freedom, with some twenty-eight or thirty, I may almost say, of such men as these ; and the results of these interviews have given me a hopeful confidence in the calmly and slowly

gathering power of the Reform School in the Church of North Italy which I never had before.

In one cathedral city, as a Canon of the Duomo assured me, there are over fifty priests in sympathy, more or less, with the movement. In another, an equally distinguished ecclesiastic told me that two-thirds of the parish clergy, as well as the same proportion of the cathedral Canons, read the *Esaminatore* with more or less approval,—a statement confirmed by several Prevosti and other priests to whom he took me. These are indeed special cases, but they are not entirely exceptional; and there is reason to believe that if two or three of the most intolerant of the Lombard and Venetian Bishops could be succeeded by Liberal men, the statistics of Reform in their neighborhood would be almost as surprising.

The very fact that these men are Reformers, in however moderate degree, implies of course that they all unhesitatingly reject the infallibility of the Pope and of the Roman Catholic Church. Upon this point they can be considered as all substantially agreed.

So also upon the necessity of very greatly restraining the power and authority of the Pope. As a general thing they adhere in theory to some kind of pre-eminence for the Bishop of Rome. While none, I think, acknowledge any superiority of *order* over that of the Episcopati, a general conviction still remained that the Papacy must necessarily be retained as a centre of unity, a presiding officer, a supreme executive of the Church. The most conservative views I heard expressed, and the most advanced alike were to my mind but *resting places* for their convictions. Under no circumstances can I imagine the Pope consenting to accept such a position as the most Papal of these men would assign to him; and as one of the most advanced himself remarked, "Why waste labor in discussing barren theories, which will be in due time most satisfactorily controverted by the progress of events." But an interesting illustration of the extent to which at the least they would curb the Papal power, may be given in the words of an eminent ecclesiastic, a Monsignore and cathedral Canon, and perhaps the most conservative subscriber to the *Esaminatore* I ever met. He was trying to prove the necessity of all other Churches gathering round the Papacy, admitted the impossibility of it under the present circumstances, and the necessity of both an abolition of the temporal and a modification of the spiritual power, but added that it was absolutely essential to have a visible, living *centre of unity*. "There could be," he urged, "no harmony in the faith without it. It was not necessary that all Churches should be *in unison*, but they must be in accord, in harmony; and therefore it was necessary to have a *Maestro di Cappella*. This was the Pope—nothing more. The sacred music should be set before him; he must not alter a note of it,—he must not add or take anything from it, he had no authority to do that; but in strict accordance with the music he must,"—and here the Canonico completed his sentence by the most expressive pantimime, waving his hand up and down, to and fro, as if holding an invisible baton, marking time *crescendo, diminuendo*, &c.

Another worthy Abate, speaking of the same subject, said: "It was difficult to foresee how the question of a Papal supremacy could be settled; it was only certain that it ought to be settled in some way, and that way should be humbly sought for by us all together, in the spirit of humility and godly love."

Most striking was the language in which some of these priests spoke of the practical result of the Roman Catholic system. For instance, one who fills a university professorship declared to me his conviction that religion had spread over Italy just in proportion to the closeness of the relation which different parts of the land had maintained with Rome. He was "more hopeful for

Lombardy and Venice ; but in the late Papal States the priests had neither considered themselves, nor been regarded by others, as a sacred ministry of divine truth and redeeming love, but as instruments of a hated civil misgovernment. They are therefore despised,"—(it was a priest in full standing who told me this!)"—"and have consequently *no self-respect*. The *Papacy*," continued he, "*has practically crushed out common decent respect for Christianity*." Another very eminent dignitary of the Church in Lombardy spoke of the Pope as being "morally in schism—the schism not indeed actualized, but existing morally." This same ecclesiastic also said plainly that "the worship of the Church was very unreal, for the worshippers had no intelligent part in it." And on another occasion, when I was speaking of the manner in which some one had defended the Romish Church against the charge of practical idolatry, he replied, "Our divines have two entirely different religious systems: one to put forward in controversy, and which exists only in *theory*; and another very different for *use*. What do the people know, for instance, about the distinctions of *dulia* and *hyper dulia* and *latia*? Our image and saint worship is *practically* idolatrous." And still again, another learned cathedral dignitary, when I playfully used the words "us heretics," replied soberly by putting his hand on mine, almost as if gently rebuking my levity, "It is the Pope, *caro*, and the Jesuits who are the heretics; the Jesuits who have the Pope now in their hand, using him like a puppet. They have put away the worship of Christ out of the Church; and they divide the actual worship between the Madonna and the Pope, in order that by bringing the intellect and the heart under subjection to an unmanly and sensuous religion, they may more easily subject the Church, and if possible, through the Church, the world to their own rule."

The programmes of Reform are very various. The quotations just made will give some idea of the kinds of need most realized. The sense of corruption is often vague and general, rather than specific; very many carefully limit their proposals for reform to matters of discipline, scrupulously reserving dogmas, but usually, I have noticed, on the assumption that dogmas of the faith, being positive and immutable, have of course not been changed. Again, some draw a distinction between those which really *are* and those which are *declared* to be dogmas of the Church, which is pretty much what we should call a distinction between what they *ought to be* and what they *are*. A Monsignore, who was too conservative to be able to approve of more than the motive and general aim of the *Esaminatore*, said to me "that the *discipline* and practical working of the Church needed a thorough revision; but not so the *dogmas*." He added, however, that "what he regarded as the real dogmatic theory of the Church was, in many respects, very different from the accepted theology of the day." He denied, for instance, that the Papal decree of 1854 really made the Immaculate Conception a dogma of the Church; and he also spoke of saint worship, condemning the form which it generally took, and explaining what he called catholic doctrine as only inculcating "a reverential meditation and study of their example and thanksgiving to God for the same."

Others of the reforming ecclesiastics were quite ready to admit the need for reform in respect to dogmas also. A *very* able set of papers contributed to the *Esaminatore* about two years since, and afterwards reprinted in pamphlet form; and the programme of the *Lettre Piacentine*, without making any such distinction between discipline and dogma, avows the necessity of revising the whole system of the Church, and testing it,—preserving or rejecting everything according as it is found on an honest inquiry to be sustained or condemned by Holy Scripture, as interpreted and illustrated by the primitive Councils and early Fathers of the Church.

Naturally, therefore, this school of ecclesiastics unite in exalting the Holy Scriptures, and insisting upon their free circulation in the vulgar tongue among the laity. Tiboni's work upon this subject has been more than once referred to; and I have yet to find a single exception among these priests to their adherence to the great principle, that the foundations of reform must be laid and the value and permanence of its results secured in the widespread and thorough study of the Word of God, by the people as well as by the priesthood.

This was the subject of a very earnest conversation in one instance, where were present an eminent cathedral dignitary, two prominent Prevosti, and two Curati. A brief extract from my notes of this conversation will fairly illustrate the feeling on this subject.

One of these Prevosti spoke of the prevailing ignorance of the Bible as being one of the chief difficulties. He asked me when, by whom, and from what sources our English Bible was translated, congratulated us upon having one common version, whose language was familiar alike to all, whereas the continental nations had different versions, and no one had that hold upon the reverent affection of the people that it ought. He thought this one cause of the want of reverence for the Bible prevailing in Europe; and he laid great emphasis upon the need of one common, faithful, authoritative Italian version, freely given to the people. Others of those present agreed with him and spoke of the prevailing ignorance of the Bible, as depriving the priest largely of his power to teach, since the people would not understand anything beyond the *elements* of expository teaching. Indeed all felt this ignorance of the Bible to be the great obstacle to Reform, since so few realized or felt the force of an appeal to Holy Scriptures, or its supreme claim upon their faith and obedience.

None of these ecclesiastics propose any immediate step, but generally regard the work as in the stage of *preparation*. I asked one—a pre-eminently leading mind among them—what he proposed to do. "Senta caro," replied he; this is God's work, not man's. For God's work He makes His own occasions. It is for us to prepare for His time; and when He is ready for us to act, He will both indicate to us clearly the time and show us the way." Again, another said, that he looked forward to the proposed Council to be held at Rome, as it was *then* thought, in December *next*, believing that this would, in some way, prove an era in the Church, and make clear before their feet the path of the Italian Reformers. "From that Council GOD will make His purposes to evolve themselves in a way which we little suspect, and which the Curia Romana and the Jesuits assuredly do not look for." In this hope and confidence he looked upon Garibaldi's expedition of last Fall, and defeat at Montano, as most providential. Had he succeeded, the Council could not have been held, and perhaps not on the other hand, if he had not undertaken this attack on Rome; for it was their triumph and the return of the French which had emboldened the Pope to venture upon this step. Certain it is, that since these events the Papal Court has exhibited an arrogant confidence that quite surpasses itself, and which is perhaps necessary to the ends which GOD has in view in this coming Council. This certainly is the view of many of the leading Reformers, while others look to it, and wait for it as the last hope of a reforming policy on the part of the authorities of the Church—whose failure is essential to their willingness to act independently.

It was a fond dream of some—indeed at one time it was that of Cardinal d'Andrea—that the Pope would invite to such a Council, should he summon it, the Oriental and Anglican Episcopate; that they would attend, and that measures should be then and there devised to bring about the re-union of

Christendom. It was a hope which manifestly sprang from the heart rather than the judgment; for I should think that these men knew too well the constitution of the Roman Curia. But that there exists a widespread yearning among the liberal Italian priests, for some such a result is a most tangible fact. Indeed I have had reason to believe that the growing desire for such mutual consultation, and for the reunion of the Church, is a real power even among some who are not primarily reformers. An ecclesiastic, noted for his eloquence as a preacher, the elevation of his religious views, and his warm-hearted philosophic liberality—a Catholic Canon moreover, in whose study I spent a delightful hour of conference on these subjects—spoke very earnestly to this effect: He frankly told me that “he did not take the *Esaminatore*, because he thought it too advanced and wanting in proper deference towards the authorities of the Church.” But he added, “that in a day when rationalism and infidelity were progressing so fearfully, it was no time for *Christians* to be expending against each other the energies which should all be directed against the common enemies of God, of Christ, and of the souls of men. There should be but two bodies—*believers and unbelievers*. The great need of Christianity was the restoration of unity, and no one body should entrench itself in an arrogated *infallibility* and demand of all others simply submission. The Latin, the Greek, and the Anglican Churches should all meet, on the assumed ground that there might be errors on all sides, and with the determination on each side that no sacrifice, which does not involve the Faith, should be wanting to bring about reunion.”

Others more advanced in their views, and more independent in their course, already begin to look with singular interest upon our Church. I was assured by more than one, to quote language used by a prominent ecclesiastic, “that the Lambeth Conference, its introductory resolution and Encyclical, and its general tone and spirit, so thoroughly and truly catholic, had made a *profound impression* on the Liberal, and especially on the reforming priests of Italy, and had already exercised an influence in encouraging the Reform movement.”

I was everywhere questioned about the Anglican Church, but especially about the American branch of it. This was doubtless in part because of my own nationality; but since their ideas of Reform are far more clearly defined and advanced in respect to corruptions in discipline, and since *our* system in some leading points is substantially identical with their own ideal, they have shown an intense desire to know more of us. Their whole scheme of a “*Free Church in a Free State*,” together with such degree of central authority as they yet concede to the Pope, creates a strong, but perhaps not wholly unnatural prejudice, against the established condition of the Church of England, whose practical results to the Church they greatly exaggerate.

Again and again I have had occasion to detail, as well as my knowledge of Italian would admit, the exact facts about our ecclesiastical anatomy; the whole process of electing, confirming, and consecrating a Bishop; the constitutional and practical working of our Diocesan and General Conventions; and the functions of the laity, and modes of securing their active interest and participation in the work of the Church. In this latter point the presence of the layman already spoken of as joining me on this tour, and his own testimony, created the deepest interest,—such as none can understand who do not know how almost universally the intelligent laity of Italy are alienated from, if not arrayed against the Church and religion. As an illustration of this interest I may mention, that in one cathedral city of North Italy, a number of ecclesiastics, with a cathedral dignitary at their head, have united themselves for the express purpose of a correspondence with our Church, in order to acquire accurate information concerning it. Again, a learned and well known ecclesiastic of the Reformed School proposed a correspondence be-

tween himself and me in the columns of the *Esaminatore*, a proposition which, of course, I was obliged to decline as beyond the scope of my mission. Another, and one of the most able as well as eminent in position of these priests, expressed the feeling that the possibility of substantial community of principle between our Church and themselves was full of hope to them; and he was anxious that great pains should be taken on both sides to understand each other more thoroughly. "Perhaps," he said, "God *may* permit a formal conciliation between us!" "But," he at once added, as if apologetically, "understand me—I do not speak of a conciliation between your Church and Rome as it now is. That is absurd to talk of—indeed, impossible, except on terms which would be disgraceful to you. But perhaps God may grant some time a conciliation between you and *us* on a pure and primitive basis."

* * * * *

Rome has alienated the laity from all interest in religious matters whatsoever, retaining herself the power to exact what she herself wants from ignorance and superstition; and over *ecclesiastical* incomes she possesses absolute control. Truly God only can raise up for the impending struggle either the pecuniary or moral power of maintaining it.

At a time when the summons has just gone forth for a *quasi* Œcumenical Council at Rome,—a Council which will be an era in the religious history of the age, and which will put an end to the last lingering hope of Reform from the Pope or the Curia Romana and the Jesuits,—a Council which will, in my opinion, draw a clearly defined line between the Ultramontane or *Jesuit* and the truly *Catholic* elements of Latin Christendom,—I cannot believe the Church will fail to watch with the intensest interest the developments of Reform principles and genuine Catholic yearnings in the Church of Italy. For this reason I trust I shall be pardoned the length at which I have trespassed in my reports upon the Committee and the Church.

I am, dear sir, faithfully yours,

MM. CHAUNCY LANGDON.

TO JAMES S. MACKIE, Esq.,

Sec. *ad int.* and Treas. Italian Committee, New York.

I conclude with a very few remarks on the subject of the Eastern, or Greek Church, which numbers some eighty millions in its Communion. From all we can gather—from writings in this Continent, at home, and in Russia—there does seem to be an earnest desire, on the part of that Church, to escape from isolation, and to seek, as well as to accord, sympathy with other communities of Christendom. "If there be one matter upon earth," said the Bishop of Oxford, at a meeting at Canterbury, "which it would be a blessed thing to help forward, it would surely be the interchange of the visible acts of communion between our branch of the Church at Home, and in America, with the orthodox branches of the Eastern Church."

The position of our Bishop of British Columbia, whose Diocese is actually conterminous with a Diocese of the Russian Church, and the position of ecclesiastical affairs in California, have suggested the necessity of this step.

As I do but glance at this subject, I recommend any who may feel interested in it, to read for themselves some remarks about it contained in the February number of "Good Words," for 1865. How wonderful the thought of re-uniting the two great branches

of Christ's Vine, which, shooting forth centuries ago from the same parent stock in Asia Minor, and trending, the one towards the East, and the other towards the West, have, at length, so extended their growth, as to encompass the Globe, and are now beginning to intertwine their foliage in Asia and America! From the coasts of India and China, our Missionaries are moving onward. Soon the outposts of the two Churches will meet face to face. Upon the success of the movement now going on, depends whether they shall meet as rivals, or as brethren beloved, and though differing in rites, and language, and manners—yet of the “one Lord, one faith, one baptism”

I have lately seen letters from different Dignitaries of the Greek Church, expressive of an irrepressible longing for unity with ours. Dr. Hill—the American Missionary of the Church, at Athens, whom I had the pleasure of meeting there several years ago—writes: “how very much, of late, the Greeks have been attracted by our service!” He says, “Our little Church, and the order and solemnity of its Divine worship, are themes of the admiration of the clergy and laity of the Greek Church. I declare my intimate persuasion that the silent influence of the American mission in Greece, during the last thirty years, and the effect produced by the public services of our Church—leading first to enquiry and then to satisfactory information respecting our Protestant doctrines and worship—have gradually brought about a striking change in public opinion.” “My conclusions,” he adds, “drawn from my interviews with the Greek clergy, and from examination of what is really taught and held in the Church of free Greece, are that the Holy Scriptures, and the Evangelical doctrines drawn from that pure source, as set forth summarily in the Nicene Creed, are the only standards to which she clings with pertinacity.”

Does not our Church, then, present a centre of communion to all other bodies of Christians in the world?

It has been well remarked as strange, but as showing the longing which exists for christian unity, that, at a period when the States were convulsed with civil war, the Fathers of the American Church should have met quietly in Synod and discussed the best mode of extending the right hand of fellowship to their brethren of the Eastern Church!

May the prayer of Archbishop Laud be ours:—

“Bless, O Gracious Father, Thine Holy Catholic Church, fill it with Truth and Grace; where it is corrupt, purge it; where it is in error, direct it; where it is superstitious, rectify it; where it is amiss, reform it; where it is right, strengthen and confirm it; where it is divided and rent asunder, heal the breaches of it, O Thou Holy One of Israel.”

